

| | | |
|---|---------------------------|------------------|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/662,929 | PUTT ET AL. |
| | Examiner Michael I Poe | Art Unit 1732 |

All Participants:

Status of Application: Amended after Non-Final Action

(1) Michael I Poe (Examiner). (3) _____.

(2) John Olivo (Applicant's attorney). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 27 April 2004

Time: 11:00 am

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejection of Claim 34

Claims discussed:

34

Prior art documents discussed:

the prior art of record

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On 4/23/04, the examiner called the applicant's attorney to inform him that the terminal disclaimer filed on 4/7/04 had been disapproved because he was not currently an attorney of record. However, the examiner informed the applicant's attorney that the terminal disclaimer would be approved if he submitted a new power of attorney executed by the attorneys listed in the Declaration naming him as an attorney of record. The applicant's attorney faxed the examiner a new power of attorney as discussed on 4/23/04.

On 4/27/04, the examiner called the applicant's attorney to discuss amendments that were necessary to place the application in condition for allowance. Although the applicant's attorney apparently intended to cancel claim 34 as set forth in the remarks filed on 4/7/04 (see 1st paragraph on page 7), claim 34 was included in the listing of claims filed on 4/7/04. Since claim 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 in the previous Office action, the application would not be in condition for allowance without the cancellation of claim 34. During the telephone interview on 4/26/04, the applicant's attorney acknowledged that claim 34 was intended to be cancelled and authorized the cancellation of claim 34 via Examiner's Amendment. The applicant's attorney also authorized changing the title as indicated in the Examiner's Amendment so that the title better reflected the allowed invention.